



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

the war America produced 10,000 tons of gas, much of which was sold to the French and British. The production of a twelve-cylinder Liberty engine was America's chief contribution to aviation. Before the Armistice 13,574 had been completed, 4,435 shipped to the Expeditionary forces, and 1,025 delivered to the Allies.

American air squadrons brought down in combat 755 enemy planes, while their own losses of planes numbered only 357. Two out of every three American soldiers who reached France took part in battle. The number who reached France was 2,084,000, and of these 1,390,000 saw active service at the front. Of the 42 divisions that reached France 29 took part in active combat service. Seven of them were regular army divisions, eleven organized from the national guard, and eleven made up of the national army troops.

American divisions were in battle for 200 days and engaged in 13 major operations. In October, 1918, the American divisions held 101 miles of line, or 23 per cent of the entire western front. In the battle of St. Mihiel 550,000 Americans were engaged, as compared with about 100,000 on the Northern side in the battle of Gettysburg. The American artillery fired more than 1,000,000 shells in four hours, which is the most intensive concentration of artillery fire recorded in history.

Of every 100 American soldiers and sailors who served in the war with Germany, two were killed or died of disease during the period of hostilities. The total number of battle deaths of all nations in this war was greater than all the deaths in all of the wars in the previous 100 years. The American casualty rate in the infantry was higher than in any other service, and that for officers was higher than for men. For every man killed in battle six were wounded. Five out of every six men sent to hospitals on account of wounds were cured and returned to duty. In the Expeditionary forces battle losses were twice as large as deaths from disease.

In this war the death rate from disease was lower and the death rate from battle was higher than in any other previous American war. Inoculation, clean camps, and safe drinking water practically eliminated typhoid fever among our troops in this war. Pneumonia killed more soldiers than were killed in battle. Meningitis was the next most serious disease.

The war cost the United States considerably more than \$1,000,000 a hour for over two years. The direct cost was about \$22,000,000,000, or nearly enough to pay the entire cost of running the United States Government from 1791 to the outbreak of the European war. Our expenditures in this war were sufficient to have carried on the Revolutionary War continuously for more than 1,000 years, at the rate of expenditure which that war actually involved. In addition to this huge expen-

diture, nearly \$10,000,000,000 have been lent by the United States to the Allies.

The army expenditures have been over \$14,000,000,000, or nearly two-thirds of our total war costs. Although the army expenditures are less than two-thirds of our total war costs, they are nearly equal to the value of all the gold produced in the whole world from the discovery of America up to the outbreak of the European war. The pay of the army during the war cost more than the combined salaries of all the public-school principals and teachers in the United States for the five years of 1912 to 1916. The United States spent about one-eighth of the entire cost of the war and something less than one-fifth of the expenditures of the Allied side.

But these statements and figures do not give an adequate picture of the valuable contribution from the trained hand of Dr. Ayres, as his report gives 72 diagrams, 14 tables, and 12 maps, all drafted with great skill and arranged with a maximum of clarity and purpose.

## SOLVING THE UNSOLVABLE

THE ALLIES, for defensive and prudential reasons, have held together, and Germany has been invaded by British, French, and Belgian troops. A region of the Fatherland rich in industrial resources and strategically important is undergoing "military occupation." But no real settlement of the issues at stake between Germany and the Allies is heralded by this procedure. Discussion must go on, and under more embittered conditions. The economic reconstruction of Europe is not hastened by the process, nor the slide toward the brink of the abyss checked. Increased costs to national exchequers for the military occupation will add to the burdens of France and England; but it is no more evident than it was prior to the meeting of the conference how the debts of the nations are to be paid, how Germany's economic reconstruction is to be guided, without at the same time curtailing the trade of the Allies.

Blame, absolute and comparative, for the outcome of the London Conference it is not difficult to assign; but the time has come when from some source wisdom and moral courage equal to the task of reconciliation and reconstruction must be derived. Politics, economics, and high finance have failed to provide the way out. The "Higher Law," to which great prophets and great judges appeal, must be invoked. Hate, fear, covetousness, and ambition must be subordinated to justice and mercy.

Standing outside the circle, able to view conditions objectively, and with a great record as a preacher and practitioner of mediation and arbitration, stands the United States. She can volunteer her aid or she can be

asked to give it; and this as an unentangled nation, politically considered. It would be a great rôle to play, comparable with that which she had in the war, when it was an issue of force opposed to force, and her 2,000,000 troops in France turned the scales in favor of the opponents of autocracy.

## THERE MIGHT BE A BETTER BEGINNING

**S**OME MEMBERS of the new administration have not made the best possible start. As guests of the Navy League, banqueting amid the salubrities of a fashionable Washington hotel March 5—note the date—the new Secretary of War, the new Secretary of the Navy, and the new Assistant Secretary of the Navy seem prematurely to have returned to the Prussian doctrine of the pathetic few—Hobson, Mahan, Maxim. Our old friend, Col. Robert M. Thompson, honorary president of the Navy League, eclipsed by the lowering clouds of Josephus Daniels, has burst into full glory again. He was present and praised the qualifications of the new Secretary of the Navy. He said: "Imagine what he can do for us in the next four years, starting as he does now, with these qualifications." This was following Secretary Denby's speech, in which he said: "I want a big navy, and I hope we shall conclude our present building program. Our navy should be as large as that of any other nation in the world."

Secretary Weeks, less vehement than Secretary Denby, nevertheless approved the remarks, while Colonel Roosevelt made the old meaningless criticisms of the "Pacifists" quite in the grand style of his illustrious father and with the same wanton disregard of any definition of the word. Nothing in the speeches of any possibility of co-operative reduction of armaments. Nothing of international co-operation in behalf of a constructive peace. They seemed for the most part to repeat the strangely discredited philosophy of Frederick the Great, who said:

"By its nature, my kingdom is military, and, properly speaking, it is only by its help that you must hope to maintain and aggrandize yourself. . . . To make one's self respected and feared by one's neighbors is the very summit of high politics. . . . Above all, endeavor to pass with them for a dangerous man, who knows no other principles but those that lead to glory."

Judging from the reports of the dinner, Count Helmuth von Moltke seemed to have entered the room and to have directed the discourse, for the notion seemed to prevail there, as it did with the great German general field-marshal, that "eternal peace is a dream; not even a beautiful dream; war is a part of God's cosmic system."

In the absence of any references to an international organization for peace, one might assume that Adolf

Lasson, too, with his theories of the kultur ideal and its relation to war had reappeared in the new cabinet. The impression we gather of the meeting is an impression of men believing with Lasson, that "between States there can be but *one* form of right: the right of the strong"; or, as he says later, "The highest right, the last right, depends on the sword. . . . No State which itself is powerful doubts the right of might."

In an ungoverned world such as is ours, the United States needs an efficient navy; but it should be the privilege of every member of the present administration to emphasize now those healing things which soothe the wounds of war. Such "big talk" and from such sources, one day after the inauguration of the new President, talk unmodified by Mr. Harding's challenge to an "autocracy of service," and "to approximate disarmament," is neither enlightening nor as encouraging for our foreign policy as might just now be expected.

## WHAT AND WHOM DOES THIS MEAN?

**R**OOSEVELT HITS PACIFISTS." Under this familiar caption the press quotes from the remarks of Lieutenant-Colonel Theodore Roosevelt, Jr., remarks made at the jollification dinner of the Navy League in Washington, March 5. Colonel Roosevelt is quoted as saying:

"Pacifism in this country is not as dead as I would like to see it. We were unprepared for the last war and we must not forget that wars will come in the future. And yet the pacifists are putting up their heads again with their brittle intellects."

We wish the Colonel would define this word "pacifism," for evidently we are in for a renaissance of tirades against it. It may be a very sad and dangerous "ism." It may be the foul thing that brought on the world war, with its 10,000,000 dead boys and its aftermath of suffering around the world. If it is, it should be anathematized until "dead."

And who are the "pacifists"? From the nature of the word, one may assume that they are men and women concerned to prevent war. If so, they must include those who drafted the Republican platform at Chicago, and such men as Mr. Root, Mr. Harding—indeed, practically all of the Republican leaders of many years, many of them men of widest experience in foreign affairs, men looked upon as representing the aspiration of the American people, Secretaries of State, members of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, Presidents, including, indeed, the father of our new Assistant Secretary of the Navy. When the Republican platform said, "The Republican party stands for agreement among the nations to preserve the peace of the world" it expressed the views of pacifists, if our definition be accepted.